

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/985,755	Applicant(s) KUDO ET AL.	
	Examiner Drew E Becker	Art Unit 1761	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Drew E Becker. (3) _____
 (2) Richard Chinn. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 April 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed: Yokomichi et al

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed the Yokomichi et al reference. Discussed whether the reference teaches the claimed amounts. This will be further examined in applicant's written response. Further search & consideration could be needed. Discussed the double patenting as well. No agreement was reached.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Drew Becker
 Examiner's signature, if required